



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/605,078	09/07/2003	Jiann-Jou Chen	WISP0024USA	2077
27765	7590	01/26/2006	EXAMINER	
NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION P.O. BOX 506 MERRIFIELD, VA 22116			PHAM, TAMMY T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2675	

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/605,078

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Tammy Pham

Art Unit

2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 and 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (US Patent No: 2004/0135738 A1).

As for claim 1, Kim teaches of a computer system (200) comprising:

a computer host comprising:

a first housing (300);

a first display screen (300) disposed on the first housing (300) for displaying images;

a display controller electrically connected to the first display screen (300) for outputting a first video signal to initiates the first display screen (300) to display images corresponding to the first video signal;

and an output port disposed on the first housing (300), the output port being electrically connected to the display controller for transmitting a second video signal generated from the display controller;

and a display module comprising:

a second housing (2,4);

Art Unit: 2675

a latch device (33) disposed on the second housing (2,4) being capable of removably fixing the second housing (2,4) on the first housing (300);

a second display screen (2,4) disposed on the second housing (2,4) for display images; and

an input port being capable of removably connecting the output port of the computer host for receiving the second video signal to initiate the second display screen (2,4) to display images corresponding to the second video signal in Fig. 4 and in section [0069].

As for claim 2, Kim teaches of the computer system of claim 1 wherein the second display screen (2,4) comprises a liquid crystal display (LCD) panel in section [0002].

As for claim 3, Kim teaches of the computer system of claim 2 wherein the display module (Fig. 4) further comprises a digitizer disposed inside the second housing (2,4), and the digitizer is electrically connected to the computer host through the output port of the computer host in section [0214].

As for claim 9, Kim teaches that the computer system of claim 1 wherein the computer host is a portable computer in section [0002].

As for claim 10, Kim teaches that the computer system of claim 1 wherein the display module further comprises a cradle, and the latch device (33) is capable of

Art Unit: 2675

removably fixing the display module on either the cradle or the computer host in section [0064-5].

As for claim 11, Kim teaches that the computer system of claim 10 wherein the input port of the display module is capable of being electrically connected to a display driving device for receiving video signals generated from the display driving device to initiate the second display screen (2,4) to display images corresponding to the video signals in section [0063].

As for claim 12, Kim teaches that the computer system of claim 11 wherein the display driving device is the display controller of the computer host in section [0137].

As for claim 13, Kim teaches that the computer system of claim 1 wherein the output port of the computer host is positioned on a portion of the first housing corresponding to the first display monitor, and the input port of the display module is positioned on the latch device in section [0065].

As for claim 14, Kim teaches that the computer system of claim 1 wherein the latch device comprises a pivot unit rotationally connected to the second display screen for adjusting a location associated with a display surface of the second display screen in section [0071].

Art Unit: 2675

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (US Patent No: 2004/0135738 A1).

As for claim 4, Kim teaches of a computer system of claim 3.

Kim does not teach of a glass above the surface of the LCD panel.

Examiner takes official notice that it is well known to use a protective glass disposed above a display surface of the LCD panel for protecting the LCD panel in order to protect the apparatus.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a glass with the device of Kim so as to protect the LCD panel.

As for claims 6 and 8, Kim teaches of the computer system of claim 5 with a digitizer.

Kim does not specify that the digitizer is an electromagnetic and/or resistive digitizer.

Examiner takes official notice that the digitizer can be of an electromagnetic digitizer {claim 6} and/or a resistive digitizer {claim 8} because it is obvious and well

Art Unit: 2675

known in the art to use a EM or resistive digitizer because in doing so, it does not deter the apparatus from accomplishing its designed functions.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made have the digitizer as taught by Kim be of an electromagnetic and/or resistive model since the technologies offers a magnitude of benefits including easier and stable calibration, better clarity of the screen and enhanced durability; all while maintaining the overall operation of the apparatus.

Claims 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (US Patent No: 2004/0135738 A1) in view of Iwamoto (US Patent No: 2003/0025677).

As for claims 5 and 7, Kim teaches of the computer system of claim 3.

Kim does not teach that the LCD panel is above the digitizer.

Iwamoto teaches that the LCD panel is disposed above the digitizer {claim 5} and that the digitizer is above the display surface of the LCD screen {claim 7} in section [0005].

It would have been obvious to with one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to dispose the digitizer either above or under the LCD screen as taught by Iwamoto with the computer system of Kim in order to detect detailed writing while minimizing the trail and error (see Iwamoto: section [0004]).


### *Conclusion*

Art Unit: 2675

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tammy Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-7773. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30 (Mon-Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz can be reached on (571) 272-3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Tammy Pham  
January 20, 2006

  
**KENT CHANG**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**